

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 13, and 15 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 13, and 15 have been amended. New claim 16 has been added.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,177,685 (Davis).

Davis is directed to an automobile navigation system using real time spoken driving instructions. According to Davis, a vehicle location system uses data from a position sensor installed in the automobile to track the location of the automobile. Discourse generating programs compose driving instructions and other messages which are communicated to the driver using a voice generating apparatus as the driver proceeds along the route. See Davis, column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 3.

In at least one embodiment of the present invention, the word provision unit attaches a code, which is to be a provisional name, to a data group stored in the database with no word until a word is provided, and replaces the code previously attached with a word input. See specification of the present invention, page 17, lines 10-14.

Applicants respectfully submit that currently amended independent claim 1, for example, is patentable over Davis, as Davis does not teach or suggest, “wherein a provisional code is temporarily attached to a data group stored in the database without a word until a word is provided,” as recited in the claim.

Assuming *arguendo* that Davis stores data groups in a database with an attached word, Davis does not temporarily attach a provisional code until a word is provided. The “verbs” of Davis, which the Examiner alleges are tantamount to the present invention’s words, are simply stored voice terms and are not temporarily attached to the word groups.

Therefore, Davis fails to teach or suggest the above-identified feature of claim 1. As currently amended independent claims 2, 13, and 15 recite language similar to that of independent claim 1, claims 2, 13, and 15 are patentable over Davis for at least the reasons presented for independent claim 1. As dependent claim 3 depends from independent claim 2, dependent claim 3 is patentable over Davis for at least the reason presented above.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 16 is patentable over Davis, as Davis does not teach or suggest, “executing a behavior pattern corresponding to the input word when said input word is present in a database; and selecting a behavior pattern from a choice of possible

behavior patterns stored in advance when said input word is absent from the database," as recited in independent claim 16.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/19/06

By: Thomas L. Jones  
Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501